



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,161	07/28/2003	Michael H. Stockmaster	02CR377/KE	4366

7590 05/17/2005

Attention: Kyle Eppele
Rockwell Collins, Inc.
M/S 124-323
400 Collins Rd. NE
Cedar Rapids, IA 52498

EXAMINER

PHAN, DAO LINDA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3662

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/628,161

Applicant(s)

STOCKMASTER, MICHAEL H.

Examiner

Dao L. Phan

Art Unit

3662

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hoven et al (US 2004/0135721).

Hoven et al teach a position system, a method and apparatus for removing anti-jamming induced errors from ionospheric corrections including means for determining (abstract, lines 1-7) a delay error associated with anti-jamming processing 202, and means for calculating ionospheric corrections, the means for calculating 112, 102 ionospheric corrections either receiving pseudo range values adjusted by the delay error or calculates the ionospheric corrections in accordance with the delay error.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitehead (Pat. No. 6,397,147) in view of in view of Hoven et al (US 2004/0135721).

Whitehead teach a method of compensating for delays including determining (col 3, lines 15-29; col 5, lines 65-col 6, line 6; fig. 3, 304) a delay error, and adjusting 30

ionospheric corrections in response to the delay error. Whitehead does not teach an anti-jamming processing circuit. However, Hoven et al teach an anti-jamming processing circuit 202. It would have been obvious to employ an anti-jamming processing circuit as taught by Hoven et al into Whitehead to unjam the frequencies.

5. Claims 9-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Counselman (Pat. No. 4,894,662) in view of Hoven et al (US 2004/0135721).

Counselman teaches al teach a position system, and apparatus for removing anti- induced errors from ionospheric corrections including means for determining (fig. 7, 190; fig. 6, 190) a delay error, and means for calculating (col 2, line 1+) ionospheric corrections, the means for calculating ionospheric corrections either receiving pseudo range values adjusted by the delay error or calculates the ionospheric corrections in accordance with the delay error. Counselman does not teach an anti-jamming processing circuit. However, Hoven et al teach an anti-jamming processing circuit 202. It would have been obvious to employ an anti-jamming processing circuit as taught by Hoven et al into Counselman to unjam the frequencies.

6. Claims 9-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinal et al (US 2004/0145517) in view of Hoven et al.

Kinal et al teach al teach a position system, and apparatus for removing anti-induced errors from ionospheric corrections including means for determining (paragraph 0079; p. 8, claim 21 and 25) a delay error, and means for calculating (paragraph 0022) ionospheric corrections, the means for calculating ionospheric corrections either receiving pseudo range values adjusted by the delay error or calculates the ionospheric


corrections in accordance with the delay error. Kinal et al do not teach an anti-jamming processing circuit. However, Hoven et al teach an anti-jamming processing circuit 202. It would have been obvious to employ an anti-jamming processing circuit as taught by Hoven et al into Kinal et al to unjam the frequencies.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dao L. Phan whose telephone number is (571)272-6976. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tarcza Thomas can be reached on (571)272-6979. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


DAO PHAN
PATENT EXAMINER